

The background of the cover features a large, light blue and yellow star-shaped seal. The seal has a central circular emblem with a shield and a banner that reads "MOTIVE IS THE PUNISHMENT". The outer ring of the seal contains the text "PROBATION DEPARTMENT" at the top and "COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO" at the bottom. The star's points are decorated with stylized floral patterns.

ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT 2012

SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Mack Jenkins, Chief Probation Officer

SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Mission, Vision, Overview 1

Juvenile Field Services.....2


Juvenile Special Operations 15

Adult Field Services.....21

Adult Gang Unit.....31

Post Release Offenders Division.....36

Institutional Services40



Probation Administration Building in Kearny Mesa

LIST OF FIGURES

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Figure 1. Ward Population on the Last Day of Each Month 2010-2012 | 2 |
| Figure 2. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Wards Supervised | 3 |
| Figure 3. Wards Supervised by Region | 4 |
| Figure 4. Wards Supervised by Specialized Program | 6 |
| Figure 5. Wards Supervised by Supervision Level | 6 |
| Figure 6. Wards Supervised by Crime Type | 7 |
| Figure 7. Juvenile Referrals 2010 to 2012 by Month | 8 |
| Figure 8. Juveniles who were Referred to Probation by Ethnicity | 9 |
| Figure 9. Juveniles who Received Probation Referrals by Region..... | 9 |
| Figure 10. Referrals by Crime Type | 10 |
| Figure 11. Outcome of Referrals | 10 |
| Figure 12. Juveniles Petitions by Ethnicity | 11 |
| Figure 13. Juveniles Petitions by Region | 11 |
| Figure 14. Juvenile Petitions by Crime Type | 12 |
| Figure 15. Disposition of Juvenile Petitions Filed | 12 |
| Figure 16. Ward Petitions Found True by Crime Type | 13 |
| Figure 17. Number of Wards who Left Probation 2008-2011 | 13 |
| Figure 18. Number of Wards who Recidivated 2008-2011..... | 14 |
| Figure 19. Wards Recidivism Rate 2008-2011 | 14 |
| Figure 20. Special Operations Wards Supervised by Region | 15 |
| Figure 21. Map Showing Concentration of Special Operations: Wards Supervised | 17 |
| Figure 22. Wards Supervised in Specialized Programs | 18 |
| Figure 23. Map of Wards Supervised by the Gang Suppression Unit | 20 |
| Figure 24. Probationer Population Trend on the Last Day of Each Month 2010-2012 | 21 |
| Figure 25. Number of New Probation Grants 2010-2012..... | 22 |
| Figure 26. Percentage of Probationers Supervised by Region | 22 |
| Figure 27. Map Showing Concentration of Probationers Supervised | 24 |
| Figure 28. Probationers Supervised by Supervision Level..... | 26 |
| Figure 29. Percentage of Probationers by Crime Type | 27 |
| Figure 30. Percentage of Sex Offenders Supervised by Static-99 Risk Level | 27 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 31. Probationers under Supervision – Ending Status..... | 28 |
| Figure 32. Probationers on DUI Enforcement Caseloads by Region | 28 |
| Figure 33. Number of Probationers who Terminated Probation for Any Reason 2008-2011..... | 29 |
| Figure 34. Number of Probationers who Recidivated 2008-2011 | 29 |
| Figure 35. Probationer Recidivism Rate 2008-2011 | 30 |
| Figure 36. Percentage of Probationers Supervised by the Adult Gang Unit by Region | 31 |
| Figure 37. Map Showing Concentration of Probationers Supervised by the Adult Gang Unit | 32 |
| Figure 38. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Crime Type | 34 |
| Figure 39. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level | 35 |
| Figure 40. Percentage of PRO Supervised by Region..... | 36 |
| Figure 41. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of PRO Offenders..... | 37 |
| Figure 42. Percentage of PRO Supervised by Crime Type | 39 |
| Figure 43. Average Daily Attendance – Juvenile Detention Facilities | 40 |
| Figure 44. Reason for Detention at East Mesa and Kearny Mesa | 41 |
| Figure 45. Average Daily Attendance at the Juvenile Camps | 42 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Table 1. Wards Supervised by Region and Ethnicity | 4 |
| Table 2. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Region | 5 |
| Table 3. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Age | 5 |
| Table 4. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity | 5 |
| Table 5. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Gender | 5 |
| Table 6. Wards Specialized Program Yardstick and Caseload Size | 6 |
| Table 7. Top 10 Referring Agencies of Youth to Probation | 8 |
| Table 8. Ward 2011 Recidivism by Risk Level | 14 |
| Table 9. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Region and Ethnicity | 15 |
| Table 10. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Region | 16 |
| Table 11. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Age | 16 |
| Table 12. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity | 16 |
| Table 13. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Gender | 16 |
| Table 14. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Specialized Programs | 18 |
| Table 15. Special Operations: Ward Supervision Yardstick and Caseload Size | 19 |
| Table 16. Number of Gang-involved Wards under Supervision by Region | 19 |
| Table 17. Probationers Supervised by Region and Ethnicity | 23 |
| Table 18. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Region | 25 |
| Table 19. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Age | 25 |
| Table 20. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity | 25 |
| Table 21. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Gender | 25 |
| Table 22. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Supervision Level | 26 |
| Table 23. Probationers Supervision Yardstick and Caseload Size | 26 |
| Table 24. Probationers 2011 Recidivism by Risk Level | 30 |
| Table 25. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Region and Ethnicity | 31 |
| Table 26. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Region | 33 |
| Table 27. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Age | 35 |
| Table 28. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity | 35 |
| Table 29. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Gender | 35 |
| Table 30. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervision Yardstick and Caseload Size | 36 |
| Table 31. Number of Gang-Involved Probationers Under Supervision by Region | 37 |
| Table 32. PRO Supervised by Region and Ethnicity | 38 |
| Table 33. PRO Supervised by Risk Level and Region | 38 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 34. PRO Supervised by Risk Level and Age..... | 38 |
| Table 35. PRO Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity..... | 38 |
| Table 36. PRO by Risk Level and Gender | 39 |
| Table 37. Detention Facilities Maximum and Average Length of Stay | 41 |
| Table 38. Detainees Average Age and Gender by Facility..... | 42 |
| Table 39. Detainees Ethnicity by Facility | 43 |
| Table 40. Detainees Home Region by Facility | 43 |
| Table 41. Detainees Most Serious Offense by Facility..... | 43 |

Mission

Protect community safety, reduce crime and assist victims through offender accountability and rehabilitation

Vision

Enhancing the quality of life for San Diego County residents by creating safer communities

2012 Overview

- The department consisted of 994 sworn and 248 non-sworn staff
- The Chief Probation Officer, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Chief of Administrative Services, three Deputy Chief Probation Officers, and 13 directors administered a budget of \$1.8 million for Fiscal Year 2011-2012.
- Staff were located in 17 main facilities. In addition, staff were out-stationed at community-based organizations and law enforcement offices

This Annual Statistical Report was designed to provide answers to commonly asked questions about the Probation Department. The report provides information and statistics about the three main services: Adult Field Services, Juvenile Field Services and Institutional Services. Those data can be used by researchers, grant writers, students or citizens with an interest in knowing more about the department and the offenders we supervise.

This report was produced by the Research Division of the San Diego County Probation Department. The data was provided by Kevin Eccles and the report was created by Darla Newman. If you require information that is not included here, please contact Dr. Natalie Pearl at 858-514-3102 or Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov. Additional information about programs and services delivered by the department can be found in the Annual Report at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/probation/docs/Annual_Report_2011-2012.pdf


JUVENILE FIELD SERVICES

(Including Special Operations)

Who Probation Supervised in 2012

- 3456 Wards were supervised on December 31, 2012
- 6242 Wards were supervised throughout the year
- Average Age 16 years
- 1412 (23%) Females
- 4840 (77%) Males
- 22 % Caucasian
- 16 % African-American
- 56% Hispanic
- 2% Asian/Pacific Islander
- 4% Other

Figure 1. Ward Population on the Last Day of Each Month 2010-2012



Over the past three years (2010-2012), the population of wards on probation has decreased by 32%. The number of wards supervised for the past five years (2008-2012), has decreased by 35%. The number of 602 wards decreased by 26% in the past three years, and 29% in the past five years. Wards supervised reside in many areas of the county. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of probation wards lived in 2012.

Figure 2. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Wards Supervised





Figure 3. Wards Supervised by Region*



*Excludes transient and out-of-county wards

Table 1. Wards Supervised by Region* and Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Region | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Central | | East | | South | | North | | Total |
| White | 285 | 15.6% | 382 | 38.6% | 99 | 10.1% | 535 | 26.8% | 1301 |
| Hispanic | 986 | 54.0% | 329 | 33.2% | 720 | 73.5% | 1202 | 60.2% | 3237 |
| African-American | 453 | 24.8% | 213 | 21.5% | 101 | 10.3% | 132 | 6.6% | 899 |
| Asian | 49 | 2.7% | 11 | 1.1% | 29 | 3.0% | 44 | 2.2% | 133 |
| Other | 53 | 2.9% | 56 | 5.6% | 31 | 3.1% | 85 | 4.2% | 225 |
| Total | 1826 | 100% | 991 | 100% | 980 | 100% | 1998 | 100% | 5795 |

*Excludes transient and out-of-county wards

All wards supervised in San Diego County are assessed using a validated risk-need assessment tool known as the San Diego Regional Resiliency Check-Up (SDRRC). The wards are grouped according to their score (High, Medium, Low) and are shown in the following tables.

Table 2. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Region*

| Region | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| Central | 1266 | 34.5% | 345 | 27.5% | 84 | 20.4% | 131 | 29.0% | 1826 |
| East | 653 | 17.8% | 218 | 17.3% | 48 | 11.6% | 72 | 16.0% | 991 |
| South | 567 | 15.4% | 273 | 21.7% | 79 | 19.2% | 61 | 13.5% | 980 |
| North | 1189 | 32.3% | 421 | 33.5% | 201 | 48.8% | 187 | 41.5% | 1998 |
| Total | 3675 | 100% | 1257 | 100% | 412 | 100% | 451 | 100% | 5795 |

*Excludes transient and out-of-county wards

Table 3. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Age

| Age | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| Under 15 years | 540 | 13.6% | 239 | 17.7% | 77 | 17.7% | 96 | 19.9% | 952 |
| 15 – 16 years | 1657 | 41.7% | 595 | 44.0% | 182 | 41.9% | 182 | 37.8% | 2616 |
| 17 – 18 years | 1606 | 40.4% | 477 | 35.3% | 162 | 37.2% | 195 | 40.4% | 2440 |
| Over 18 years | 170 | 4.3% | 41 | 3.0% | 14 | 3.2% | 9 | 1.9% | 234 |
| Total | 3973 | 100% | 1352 | 100% | 435 | 100% | 482 | 100% | 6242 |

Table 4. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| White | 763 | 19.2% | 324 | 24.0% | 123 | 28.3% | 189 | 39.2% | 1399 |
| Hispanic | 2334 | 58.7% | 736 | 54.5% | 215 | 49.4% | 184 | 38.2% | 3469 |
| African-American | 689 | 17.3% | 198 | 14.6% | 43 | 9.9% | 56 | 11.6% | 986 |
| Asian | 62 | 1.6% | 37 | 2.7% | 16 | 3.7% | 22 | 4.6% | 137 |
| Other | 125 | 3.2% | 57 | 4.2% | 38 | 8.7% | 31 | 6.4% | 251 |
| Total | 3973 | 100% | 1352 | 100% | 435 | 100% | 482 | 100% | 6242 |

Table 5. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Gender

| Gender | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| Female | 872 | 22.0% | 321 | 24.0% | 81 | 18.6% | 136 | 28.2% | 1410 |
| Male | 3101 | 78.0% | 1031 | 76.0% | 354 | 81.4% | 346 | 71.8% | 4832 |
| Total | 3973 | 100% | 1352 | 100% | 435 | 100% | 482 | 100% | 6242 |

The department maintains a variety of caseload ratios for juveniles. Lower caseload sizes are designed to allow officers to engage wards in meaningful interactions to encourage behavior change. Ratios are referred to as a yardstick. Table 6 below provides information on the yardstick as well as the actual ratio of wards to officers.

Table 6. Wards Specialized Program Yardstick and Caseload Size

| Specialized Program | Yardstick | Caseload Ratio | % +/- |
|--|-----------|----------------|-------|
| Community Response Officer Program (CROP) | 1:25 | 1:19 | -24% |
| Community Transition Unit (CTU) | 1:25 | 1:28 | 12% |
| Juvenile Forensic Assistance for Stabilization and Treatment (JFAST) | 1:15 | 1:12 | -20% |
| Women and their Children (WATCh) | 1:25 | 1:15 | -40% |
| Youthful Offender Unit (YOU) | 1:25 | 1:23 | -8% |
| Sex Offender | 1:30 | 1:25 | -17% |
| Drug Court | 1:35 | 1:28 | -20% |
| Placement | 1:35 | 1:38 | 8% |
| Community Assessment Teams-Working to Insure Girls Success (CAT) | 1:35 | 1:24 | -31% |
| Aftercare | 1:40 | 1:38 | -5% |
| Gang Unit | 1:40 | 1:37 | -8% |
| Breaking Cycles | 1:50 | 1:45 | -10% |
| Truancy | 1:50 | 1:40 | -20% |
| Informal | 1:125 | 1:92 | -26% |
| Warrant Bank | 1:400 | 1:367 | -8% |

Youth who have been designated to need specialized supervision are placed as available, in programs designed to address their risk level and need profile. Specialized programs are shown in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4. Wards Supervised by Specialized Program






Figure 5. Wards by Supervision Level



This graph represents wards under supervision by the most serious crime or action that led them to being under supervision. Status offenses are those actions which are only illegal if engaged in by a minor.

Figure 6. Wards Supervised by Crime Type (Most Serious True Finding)




Juvenile Justice System Statistics

The following statistics reflect the processes that bring youth to the probation department when they commit a status or criminal offense. The process begins with a referral to the probation department citing a juvenile's behavior and recommending intervention.

In 2012, 7,443 referrals were received by the probation department. These referrals represented 5622 individual juveniles. In the past three years (2010-2012), there was a 5% decrease. Over the past five years, referrals decreased by 41%.

Figure 7. Juvenile Referrals 2010 to 2012 by Month



The agencies that made a significant number of referrals are seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Top 10 Agencies that Refer Juveniles to Probation

| Referring Agency | # of Referrals | Referring Agency | # of Referrals |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| San Diego Police Department | 1978 | El Cajon Police Department | 358 |
| San Diego Sheriff's Office | 1788 | Chula Vista Police Department | 348 |
| Escondido Police Department | 656 | School Attendance Review Board | 231 |
| San Diego Unified School District | 546 | Carlsbad Police Department | 167 |
| Oceanside Police Department | 538 | National City Police Department | 145 |

The statistics provided below are based on youth who received referrals. Figure 8 shows the ethnic breakdown of the youth who received referrals.

Figure 8. Juveniles Who Were Referred to Probation by Ethnicity






Figure 9. Juveniles who Received Probation Referrals by Region




Referrals are categorized by the most serious offense on that referral.

Figure 10. Referrals by Crime Type




Referrals are acted on in a number of ways. Only those referrals that are sent to the District Attorney can result in a petition.

Figure 11. Outcome of Referrals




The next stage in the process is for the District Attorney's office to evaluate the case for filing. In 2012, there were 2,790 petitions filed, involving 2,947 juveniles. Figure 12 shows the percentage of juveniles with petitions filed by ethnicity. The number of petitions filed decreased 9% from 2011. Figure 13 shows the percentage of juveniles who had a petition filed by region.

Figure 12. Juveniles with Petitions* by Ethnicity



*601 (Status Offenses) and 602 (Criminal Offenses)


Figure 13. Juveniles Petitions* by Region



*601 (Status Offenses) and 602 (Criminal Offenses)


Petitions have been categorized by the most serious offense on that petition.

Figure 14. Juvenile Petitions by Crime Type




Petitions can be found true by the court (a disposition called a True Finding), can be admitted true by the minor, or can be dismissed for a variety of reasons. The dispositions on petitions filed in 2012 are shown in Figure 15.

Figure 15. Disposition of Juvenile Petitions Filed



Each petition that is found or admitted true is characterized by the most serious charge on the petition. The breakdown by crime type is shown in Figure 16. Of the 2,095 petitions that were found true in 2012, Figure 16 shows the breakdown by crime type.

Figure 16. Petitions Found True by Crime Type



OUTCOMES

Recidivism: *(NOTE - Data is from fiscal year 2010-2011. This section will be updated after June 30, 2013 to reflect current 2011-2012 numbers)*

Of the 2,218 wards who terminated probation in 2011, 1,582 or 71% terminated without committing a new law violation. The recidivism rate reflects the percent of 602 wards who terminated probation and who committed a new offense. For 2011, the recidivism was 29 percent.

The number of wards supervised by probation has decreased 22% since 2008. As the number of wards supervised declined, the number of wards who leave probation also decreased. There was an almost 12% reduction in the number of wards leaving probation since 2008.

Figure 17. Number of Wards who Left Probation 2008-2011






Figure 18. Number of Wards who Recidivated 2008-2011



The number of wards who recidivated decreased 16% from 2008 to 2011 (755 to 636). The recidivism rate is based on the number of 602 wards who terminated probation divided by the number who recidivated.

Figure 19. Ward Recidivism Rate 2008-2011



The percent of wards who recidivated has remained constant since 2009. Although the number who recidivated decreased, the fact that the number of wards who left probation also decreased means that the percent stays the same.

Table 8. Ward 2011 Recidivism by Risk Level

| Risk Level | # Who Left Probation | # Recidivated | % Recidivated |
|--------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|
| High | 1420 | 556 | 39% |
| Medium | 570 | 68 | 12% |
| Low | 227 | 12 | 5% |
| No Score | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| TOTAL | 2218 | 636 | 29% |

Risk based supervision is based on the San Diego Risk and Resiliency Checkup score. This table shows that the juvenile recidivism rates are correlated with the assessed risk score.


JUVENILE SPECIAL OPERATIONS

Who Probation Supervised in 2012

- 556 wards were supervised by Special Operations on December 31, 2012
- 1,041 wards were supervised by Special Operations throughout the year
- Average Age 16.9 years
- 90 (9%) Female
- 951 (91%) Male
- 10% Caucasian
- 17% African-American
- 70% Hispanic
- 1% Asian/Pacific Islander
- 2% Other

Wards in Special Operations are supervised in one of four programs: Community Response Officer Program (CROP), Community Transition Unit (CTU), Gang Suppression Unit (GSU) and Youthful Offender Unit (YOU).

Figure 20. Special Operations Wards Supervised by Region



The 1,041 wards who were supervised by Special Operations in 2012 were a diverse group of individuals. Table 9 shows the breakdown of wards supervised in Special Operations by region and ethnicity.

Table 9. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Region* and Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Region | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Central | | East | | South | | North | | Total |
| White | 22 | 5.9% | 32 | 22.7% | 7 | 5.9% | 31 | 9.0% | 92 |
| Hispanic | 240 | 64.7% | 57 | 40.4% | 100 | 84.7% | 284 | 82.6% | 681 |
| African-American | 95 | 25.6% | 48 | 34.1% | 8 | 6.8% | 16 | 4.6% | 167 |
| Asian | 9 | 2.4% | 3 | 2.1% | 1 | 0.9% | 3 | 0.9% | 16 |
| Other | 5 | 1.4% | 1 | 0.7% | 2 | 1.7% | 10 | 2.9% | 18 |
| Total | 371 | 100% | 141 | 100% | 118 | 100% | 344 | 100% | 974 |

* Excludes transient and out-of-county youth

Table 10. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Region*

| Region | Risk Level | | | | | | |
|---------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Total |
| Central | 349 | 38.3% | 19 | 35.2% | 1 | 16.7% | 371 |
| East | 127 | 13.9% | 13 | 24.1% | 1 | 16.7% | 141 |
| South | 114 | 13.0% | 3 | 5.5% | 1 | 16.6% | 118 |
| North | 321 | 35.2% | 19 | 35.2% | 3 | 50% | 344 |
| Total | 911 | 100% | 54 | 100% | 6 | 100% | 974 |

*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

Table 11. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Age

| Age | Risk Level | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Total |
| Under 15 years | 69 | 7.1% | 6 | 10.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 75 |
| 15-16 years | 257 | 26.4% | 12 | 20.7% | 2 | 28.6% | 271 |
| 17-18 years | 582 | 60.0% | 33 | 57.0% | 4 | 57.1% | 621 |
| Over 18 years | 64 | 6.5% | 7 | 12.0% | 1 | 14.3% | 74 |
| Total | 972 | 100% | 58 | 100% | 7 | 100% | 1041 |

Table 12. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity


| Ethnicity | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| White | 91 | 9.4% | 8 | 13.8% | 1 | 14.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 100 |
| Hispanic | 682 | 70.2% | 38 | 65.5% | 4 | 57.1% | 3 | 75.0% | 727 |
| African-American | 165 | 17.0% | 11 | 19.0% | 1 | 14.3% | 1 | 25.0% | 178 |
| Asian | 16 | 1.6% | 1 | 1.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 17 |
| Other | 18 | 1.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 14.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 19 |
| Total | 972 | 100% | 58 | 100% | 7 | 100% | 4 | 100% | 1041 |

Table 13. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Gender

| Gender | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|------|------------|------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| Female | 83 | 8.5% | 6 | 10.3% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 25% | 90 |
| Male | 889 | 91.5% | 52 | 89.7% | 7 | 100% | 3 | 75% | 951 |
| Total | 972 | 100% | 58 | 100% | 7 | 100% | 4 | 100% | 1041 |

Wards supervised by Special Operations reside in many areas of the county. Some areas have a higher concentration of probation youth. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of probation youth supervised by the Special Operations were found in 2012

Figure 21. Map Showing Concentration of Special Operations: Wards Supervised



The following table shows the assignment of wards to specialized programs by risk level.


Table 14. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Specialized Program

| Specialized Program | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|--------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| CROP | 89 | 16.7% | 4 | 21.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 93 |
| CTU | 25 | 4.7% | 2 | 10.5% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 50.0% | 28 |
| Gang | 283 | 53.0% | 12 | 63.2% | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | 50.0% | 297 |
| YOU | 137 | 25.6% | 1 | 5.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 138 |
| Total | 534 | 100% | 19 | 100% | 1 | 100% | 2 | 100% | 556 |

*One day snapshot of youth in specialized programs on December 31, 2012

The following figures show the breakdown of wards who are in each program within the Special Operations division.

Figure 22. Wards Supervised in Specialized Program*



Special Operations: Juvenile Caseload Ratios

The department maintains a variety of caseload ratios for juveniles. Ratios are referred to as a yardstick. Table 15 below provides information on the yardstick as well as the actual ratio of wards to officers.

Table 15. Special Operations: Ward Supervision Yardstick and Caseload Size

| Specialized Program | Yardstick | Caseload Ratio | % +/- |
|---|-----------|----------------|-------|
| Youthful Offender Unit (YOU) | 1:25 | 1:19 | -24% |
| Community Transition Unit (CTU) | 1:25 | 1:28 | -12% |
| Gang Suppression Unit (GSU) | 1:40 | 1:38 | -5% |
| Community Response Officer Program (CROP) | 1:25 | 1:23 | -8% |

*One day snapshot of youth on December 31, 2012

In 2012, all the specialized programs had caseload ratios under the yardstick. Lower caseload sizes allow officers to engage wards in meaningful interactions to encourage behavior change.

Special Operations: Gang Statistics

Probation officers supervise gang involved wards throughout the county. Officers perform intensive supervision and case management and accountability steps that include 4th waiver searches, curfew checks, drug testing, and face-to-face contacts with wards at school, community programs, employment, and at home. Ninety-five percent (95%) of wards assigned to gang supervision have been assessed as high risk, four percent (4%) are assessed as medium risk and less than one percent (<1%) as low risk.

When the Probation Department provides information on gang members in the community under probation supervision, three groups are identified:

1. Wards who are supervised by our specialized gang officers.
2. Wards who had, as conditions of their probation, prohibitions against certain activities, thought to show affiliation with a gang.
3. Wards who have been documented as gang members or gang associates by local law enforcement and catalogued by the CalGang system. Percents are not given due to the fact that a ward can be in more than one category.


Table 16. Number of Gang-Involved Wards under Supervision by Region*

| Region | Supervised By Gang Unit | With Gang Registration Conditions | Identified as Gang Member or Associate |
|---------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Central | 88 | 46 | 125 |
| East | 28 | 14 | 38 |
| South | 30 | 24 | 41 |
| North | 138 | 92 | 177 |
| Total | 284 | 176 | 381 |

* Percentages are not given due to the fact that an offender can be in more than one category

Wards supervised by the Gang Unit reside in many areas of the county. Some areas have a higher concentration of probation youth. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of probation wards lived in 2012.

Figure 23. Map of Wards Supervised by the Gang Suppression Unit




ADULT FIELD SERVICES

Who Probation Supervised in 2012

- 13,478 probationers were supervised on December 31, 2012
- 19,027 probationers were supervised throughout the year
- Average Age 35.2 years
- 4,298 (22.6%) Female
- 14,729 (77.4%) Male
- 41% Caucasian
- 16% African-American
- 36% Hispanic
- 4% Asian/Pacific Islander
- 3% Other

Probationers are adult offenders who are supervised in regular supervision caseloads. Some probationers are supervised by the Gang Unit if they have gang affiliations or gang conditions placed on them by the Court. In the PRO Division, two types of offenders are supervised: Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) are felons released from prison for non-violent, non-serious, or non-high risk sex crimes; Mandatory Supervision Offenders (MSO) serve a split sentence – a portion of their time is completed in custody in the Sheriff's jail rather than State prison, and the balance in the community under mandatory Probation supervision. This section shows data on Probationers under supervision. Following sections will show data on offenders supervised by the Gang Unit as well as data on the PRO Unit offenders.


Figure 24. Probation Population on the Last Day of Each Month 2010-2012 *



* Includes Adult Gang Unit


Over the past three years (2010-2012), the population of probationers has decreased by 20% from 16,994 to 13,672. The number of probationers supervised for the past five years (2008-2012), has decreased by 29% from 19,165 to 13,672.

Figure 25. Number of New Probation Grants 2010-2012



The number of new probation grants to adults decreased 19% from January, 2010 to December 2012. The number of new grants decreased 21% in the past two years (2011-2012) and 8% in 2012 (January to December)

Figure 26. Percentage of Probationers Supervised by Region



The 19,027 probationers who were supervised in 2012 were a diverse group of individuals, both ethnically and geographically. Table 17 shows the breakdown of probationers by region and ethnicity.


Table 17. Probationers Supervised by Region* and Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Region | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Central | | East | | South | | North | | Total |
| White | 1941 | 36.6% | 1498 | 56.4% | 603 | 22.3% | 2370 | 51.9% | 6412 |
| Hispanic | 1521 | 28.7% | 525 | 19.7% | 1611 | 59.6% | 1548 | 33.9% | 5205 |
| African-American | 1424 | 26.8% | 464 | 17.5% | 281 | 10.4% | 322 | 7.1% | 2491 |
| Asian | 303 | 5.7% | 49 | 1.8% | 153 | 5.7% | 143 | 3.2% | 648 |
| Other | 119 | 2.2% | 122 | 4.6% | 53 | 2.0% | 180 | 3.9% | 474 |
| Total | 5308 | 100% | 2658 | 100% | 2701 | 100% | 4563 | 100% | 15230 |

*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

Probationers supervised reside in many areas of the county. Some areas have a higher concentration of probationers. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of probationers supervised were found in 2012.

Figure 27. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Probationers Supervised



Probationers supervised in San Diego County are assessed to determine the likelihood that they will offend again. In the beginning of 2009, a validated risk-need assessment tool known as the COMPAS was implemented. For those probationers who began their probation prior to early 2009, the Federal Salient Factor Score was used to assess risk. Probationers were grouped according to their score as shown in Tables 18, 19, 20 and 21.

Table 18. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Region*

| Region | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| Central | 1635 | 36.7% | 1240 | 37.1% | 2295 | 33.1% | 138 | 28.5% | 5308 |
| East | 770 | 17.3% | 585 | 17.5% | 1175 | 16.9% | 128 | 26.4% | 2658 |
| South | 728 | 16.3% | 579 | 17.3% | 1309 | 18.8% | 85 | 17.5% | 2701 |
| North | 1321 | 29.7% | 940 | 28.1% | 2168 | 31.2% | 134 | 27.6% | 4563 |
| Total | 4454 | 100% | 3344 | 100% | 6947 | 100% | 485 | 100% | 15230 |

*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

Table 19. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Age

| Age | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| 18-24 years | 1754 | 30.7% | 1116 | 27.6% | 1027 | 11.9% | 141 | 23.0% | 4038 |
| 25-34 years | 2041 | 35.8% | 1472 | 36.4% | 2953 | 34.1% | 168 | 27.4% | 6634 |
| 35-44 years | 959 | 16.8% | 719 | 17.8% | 2089 | 24.1% | 127 | 20.7% | 3894 |
| Over 45 years | 955 | 16.7% | 739 | 18.2% | 2590 | 29.9% | 177 | 28.9% | 4461 |
| Total | 5709 | 100% | 4046 | 100% | 8659 | 100% | 613 | 100% | 19027 |

Table 20. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| White | 2126 | 37.2% | 1594 | 39.4% | 3772 | 43.6% | 333 | 54.3% | 7825 |
| Hispanic | 1976 | 34.6% | 1448 | 35.8% | 3185 | 36.8% | 166 | 27.1% | 6775 |
| African-American | 1314 | 23.0% | 719 | 17.8% | 1019 | 11.8% | 79 | 12.9% | 3131 |
| Asian | 147 | 2.6% | 156 | 3.8% | 411 | 4.7% | 17 | 2.8% | 731 |
| Other | 146 | 2.6% | 129 | 3.2% | 272 | 3.1% | 18 | 2.9% | 565 |
| Total | 5709 | 100% | 4046 | 100% | 8659 | 100% | 613 | 100% | 19027 |

Table 21. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Gender

| Gender | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| Female | 1109 | 19.4% | 960 | 23.7% | 2070 | 23.9% | 159 | 25.9% | 4298 |
| Male | 4600 | 80.6% | 3086 | 76.3% | 6589 | 76.1% | 454 | 74.1% | 14729 |
| Total | 5709 | 100% | 100% | | 8659 | 100% | 613 | 100% | 19027 |

There are three supervision levels: High, Medium, and Low Risk. There is a separate supervision category called Proposition 36. Prop 36 allows first- and second-time nonviolent, simple drug possession offenders the opportunity to receive substance abuse treatment instead of incarceration.

Figure 28. Probationers Supervised by Supervision Level




Table 22. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Supervision Level

| Supervision Level | Risk Level | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|------------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | Total |
| High Risk | 4144 | 72.6% | 751 | 18.6% | 1240 | 14.3% | 49 8.0% | 6184 |
| Medium Risk | 346 | 6.1% | 1780 | 44.0% | 736 | 8.5% | 30 4.9% | 2892 |
| Low Risk | 772 | 13.5% | 1241 | 30.6% | 6289 | 72.6% | 228 37.2% | 8530 |
| P36 | 447 | 7.8% | 274 | 6.8% | 394 | 4.6% | 306 49.9% | 1421 |
| Total | 5709 | 100% | 4046 | 100% | 8659 | 100% | 613 100% | 19027 |

* Probationers fall into a variety of categories including unassigned, ended year on supervisor case load without supervision level or last caseload assignment was to Investigations

Caseload Standards


The department maintains a variety of caseload ratios for adults. Ratios are referred to as a yardstick. Table 23 below provides information on the yardstick as well as the actual ratio of probationers to officers. Lower caseload sizes allow officers to engage wards in meaningful interactions to encourage behavior change.

Table 23. Probationer Supervision Yardstick and Caseload Size

| Supervision Level | Caseload Standard | Caseload Ratio | % +/- |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------|
| High Risk | 1:50 | 1:65 | 30% |
| Medium Risk | 1:150 | 1:145 | -3% |
| Low Risk | 1:1400 | 1:619 | -56% |
| P36 | 1:125 | 1:494 | 295% |

This graph reflects the breakdown of crime types of probationers under supervision.

Figure 29. Percentage of Probationers by Crime Type



The law requires that sex offenders convicted of certain offenses register with local law enforcement as a “registered sex offender.” Some of these offenders are under probation supervision. They are required by state law to be assessed for risk of committing another sex offense using a tool known as the “Static 99.” Figure 31 shows the registered sex offenders under supervision in 2012 by assessed risk level.

Figure 30. Percentage of Sex Offenders Supervised by Static-99 Risk Level






Figure 31. Probationers under Supervision – Ending Status



DUI OFFENDERS

On any given day in 2012, the department supervised 758 DUI offenders on specialized caseloads. DUI offenders are eligible for supervision on these caseloads when they commit felony DUI offenses. In 2012, 216 high risk probationers wore a Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitoring (SCRAM) bracelet which detects alcohol abuse around the clock. Figure 32 shows the DUI probationers under supervision by region.

Figure 32. Probationers on DUI Enforcement Caseloads by Region




OUTCOMES

Recidivism: *(NOTE - Data is from fiscal year 2010-2011. This section will be updated after June 30, 2013 to reflect current 2011-2012 numbers)*

Of the 6736 adults who terminated probation in 2011, 4445 or 66% terminated without committing a new law violation. The recidivism rate reflects the percent of adults who terminated probation who committed a new offense. For 2011, the recidivism rate was 34%.

Figure 33. Number of Probationers who Terminated Probation for any Reason, 2008 to 2011



From 2008 to 2011 the number of probationers who terminated probation increased by 4%. However, the number of probationers who recidivated decreased by 5% in that same time period.

Figure 34. Number of Probationers who Recidivated, 2008 to 2011





Figure 35. Probationer Recidivism Rate, 2008 to 2011



From 2008 to 2011 the recidivism rate decreased by 2%

Table 24. Adult 2011 Recidivism by Risk Level


| Risk Level | # Who Left Probation | # Recidivated | % Recidivated |
|--------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|
| High | 1729 | 947 | 55% |
| Medium | 1577 | 639 | 41% |
| Low | 3215 | 639 | 20% |
| No Score | 215 | 66 | 31% |
| TOTAL | 6736 | 2291 | 34% |

ADULT GANG UNIT

Who Probation Supervised In Special Operations

- 385 probationers were supervised by the Adult Gang Unit on December 31, 2012
- 635 probationers were supervised by the Adult Gang Unit throughout the year
- Average Age 24.2 years
- 34 (5%) Females
- 601 (95%) Males
- 3.5% Caucasian
- 24.3% African-American
- 65.4% Hispanic
- 5.0% Asian/Pacific Islander
- 1.8% Other

Figure 36. Percentage of Probationers Supervised by the Adult Gang Unit by Region




The 619 probationers who were supervised by the Adult Gang Unit in 2012 were a diverse group of individuals. Table 25 shows the breakdown of probationers by region and ethnicity.

Table 25. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Region* and Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Region | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|
| | Central | | East | | South | | North | | Total |
| White | 5 | 2% | 5 | 9% | 3 | 4% | 4 | 3% | 17 |
| Hispanic | 113 | 53% | 26 | 46% | 59 | 73% | 136 | 87% | 334 |
| African-American | 74 | 35% | 24 | 43% | 13 | 16% | 6 | 4% | 117 |
| Asian | 17 | 8% | 1 | 2% | 4 | 5% | 4 | 3% | 26 |
| Other | 4 | 2% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2% | 6 | 3% | 12 |
| Total | 213 | 100% | 56 | 100% | 81 | 100% | 156 | 100% | 506 |

*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

Figure 37. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Probationers Supervised by the Adult Gang Unit



All probationers supervised by the Adult Gang Unit in San Diego County are assessed to determine the likelihood that they will offend again. In the beginning of 2009 a validated risk need assessment tool known as the COMPAS was implemented. For those probationers who began their probation prior to early 2009, the Federal Salient Factor Score was used to assess risk. Probationers are grouped according to their score. These groupings are shown in Tables 26, 27, 28 and 29.

Table 26. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Region*

| Region | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| Central | 134 | 41.4% | 52 | 49.5% | 25 | 34.7% | 2 | 40.0% | 213 |
| East | 35 | 10.8% | 8 | 7.6% | 11 | 15.3% | 2 | 40.0% | 56 |
| South | 48 | 14.8% | 13 | 12.4% | 20 | 27.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 81 |
| North | 107 | 33.0% | 32 | 30.5% | 16 | 22.2% | 1 | 20.0% | 156 |
| Total | 324 | 100% | 105 | 100% | 72 | 100% | 5 | 100% | 506 |

*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

Table 27. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Age

| Age | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| 18-24 years | 300 | 71.1% | 78 | 62.9% | 42 | 51.9% | 8 | 100% | 428 |
| 25-34 years | 104 | 24.6% | 37 | 29.8% | 31 | 38.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 172 |
| 35-44 years | 16 | 3.8% | 9 | 7.3% | 7 | 8.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 32 |
| Over 45 years | 2 | 0.5% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 |
| Total | 422 | 100% | 124 | 100% | 81 | 100% | 8 | 100% | 635 |

Table 28. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| White | 12 | 2.8% | 5 | 4.0% | 5 | 6.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 22 |
| Hispanic | 292 | 69.2% | 72 | 58.1% | 47 | 58.0% | 4 | 50.0% | 415 |
| African-American | 99 | 23.5% | 33 | 26.6% | 19 | 23.5% | 3 | 37.5% | 154 |
| Asian | 16 | 3.8% | 9 | 7.3% | 6 | 7.4% | 1 | 12.5% | 32 |
| Other | 3 | 0.7% | 5 | 4.0% | 4 | 4.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 12 |
| Total | 422 | 100% | 124 | 100% | 81 | 100% | 8 | 100% | 635 |

Table 29. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Gender

| Gender | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| Female | 21 | 5.0% | 7 | 5.6% | 6 | 7.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 34 |
| Male | 401 | 95.0% | 117 | 94.4% | 75 | 92.6% | 8 | 100% | 601 |
| Total | 422 | 100% | 124 | 100% | 81 | 100% | 8 | 100% | 635 |

Adult Gang Unit: Adult Yardstick

The department maintains a variety of caseload ratios. Ratios are referred to as a yardstick. Table 30 below provides information on the yardstick as well as the actual ratio of probationers to officers. In 2012 the adult gang unit had caseload ratios under the yardstick. Lower caseload sizes allow officers to engage wards in meaningful interactions to encourage behavior change.


Table 30. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervision Yardstick and Caseload Size

| Supervision Level | Yardstick | Caseload Ratio | % +/- |
|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|
| High Risk | 1:50 | 1:43 | -14% |

Adult Gang Unit: Probationer Supervision by Most Serious Crime Type

Figure 38 shows the breakdown of probationers supervised by the most serious crime that led them to being under probation supervision.

Figure 38. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Crime Type



Adult Gang Unit: Adult Supervision Statistics

Probation officers supervise probationer gang members throughout the county. Officers perform intensive supervision and case management that includes 4th waiver searches, curfew checks, drug testing, and face-to-face contacts with clients at school, community programs, employment, and at home.


The court can impose the requirement to register with local law enforcement as a gang member. The number of probationers shown in the “gang registration” column had this condition placed on them by the court. Probationers in the “identified as a gang member or associate” column had been documented by law enforcement as being either a gang member or a gang associate. These probationers have been entered into statewide gang database.

Table 31. Number of Gang-Involved Probationers under Supervision by Region*

| Region | Supervised By Gang Unit | With Gang Registration Conditions | Identified as Gang Member or Associate |
|---------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Central | 156 | 76 | 241 |
| East | 48 | 19 | 68 |
| South | 71 | 33 | 116 |
| North | 122 | 72 | 173 |
| Total | 397 | 200 | 598 |

* Percents are not given due to the fact that an probationer can be in more than one category

Figure 39. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level




POST RELEASE OFFENDERS (PRO) DIVISION

Post Release Offenders Supervised in 2012

- 1997 offenders were supervised by the PRO Division on December 31, 2012
- 3233 offenders were supervised by the PRO Division throughout the year
- Average Age 38.9 years
- 373(11.5%) Females
- 2860 (88.5%) Males
- 34.9% Caucasian
- 27.5% African-American
- 30.4% Hispanic
- 4.1% Asian/Pacific Islander
- 3.2% Other

The PRO Division supervises two types of offenders. Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) are felons released from prison for non-violent, non-serious, or non-high risk sex crimes. Mandatory Supervision Offenders (MSO) serve a split sentence – a portion of their time is completed in custody in the Sheriff's jail rather than State prison, and the balance in the community under mandatory Probation supervision.

Figure 40. Percentage of PRO Supervised by Region*



The PRO offenders, who are supervised in the PRO Division, reside in many areas of the county. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of PRO supervised by probation were found in 2012.

Figure 41. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of PRO Offenders




Table 32. PRO Supervised by Region* and Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Region | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Central | | East | | South | | North | | Total |
| White | 277 | 26.3% | 207 | 49.1% | 61 | 16.4% | 304 | 43.2% | 849 |
| Hispanic | 244 | 23.2% | 93 | 22.0% | 198 | 53.2% | 245 | 34.9% | 780 |
| African-American | 450 | 42.7% | 100 | 23.7% | 81 | 21.8% | 89 | 12.7% | 720 |
| Asian | 57 | 5.4% | 5 | 1.2% | 24 | 6.4% | 27 | 3.8% | 113 |
| Other | 25 | 2.4% | 17 | 4.0% | 8 | 2.2% | 38 | 5.4% | 88 |
| Total | 1053 | 100% | 422 | 100% | 372 | 100% | 703 | 100% | 2550 |

*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

Table 33. PRO Supervised by Risk Level and Region*

| Region | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| Central | 566 | 40.2% | 143 | 44.4% | 133 | 41.2% | 211 | 42.4% | 1053 |
| East | 221 | 15.7% | 55 | 17.1% | 52 | 16.1% | 94 | 18.9% | 422 |
| South | 216 | 15.4% | 35 | 10.9% | 55 | 17.0% | 66 | 13.2% | 372 |
| North | 404 | 28.7% | 89 | 27.6% | 83 | 25.7% | 127 | 25.5% | 703 |
| Total | 1407 | 100% | 322 | 100% | 323 | 100% | 498 | 100% | 2550 |

*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

Table 34. PRO Supervised by Risk Level and Age

| Age | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| 18-24 years | 165 | 9.3% | 26 | 6.5% | 12 | 3.2% | 26 | 3.8% | 229 |
| 25-34 years | 700 | 39.3% | 122 | 30.6% | 101 | 26.8% | 133 | 19.6% | 1056 |
| 35-44 years | 468 | 26.3% | 130 | 32.7% | 102 | 27.0% | 229 | 33.8% | 929 |
| Over 45 years | 447 | 25.1% | 120 | 30.2% | 162 | 43.0% | 290 | 42.8% | 1019 |
| Total | 1780 | 100% | 398 | 100% | 377 | 100% | 698 | 100% | 3233 |


Table 35. PRO Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| White | 625 | 35.1% | 140 | 35.2% | 155 | 41.1% | 209 | 30.8% | 1129 |
| Hispanic | 547 | 30.7% | 127 | 31.9% | 98 | 26.0% | 211 | 31.1% | 983 |
| African-American | 498 | 28.0% | 103 | 25.9% | 79 | 21.0% | 208 | 30.7% | 888 |
| Asian | 60 | 3.4% | 20 | 5.0% | 31 | 8.2% | 20 | 3.0% | 131 |
| Other | 50 | 2.8% | 8 | 2.0% | 14 | 3.7% | 30 | 4.4% | 102 |
| Total | 1780 | 100% | 398 | 100% | 377 | 100% | 678 | 100% | 3233 |

Table 36. PRO Supervised by Risk Level and Gender

| Gender | Risk Level | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | High | | Medium | | Low | | Not Scored | | Total |
| Female | 186 | 10.5% | 74 | 18.6% | 60 | 15.9% | 53 | 7.8% | 373 |
| Male | 1594 | 89.5% | 324 | 81.4% | 317 | 84.1% | 625 | 92.2% | 2860 |
| Total | 1780 | 100% | 398 | 100% | 377 | 100% | 678 | 100% | 3233 |

Figure 42. Percentage of PRO by Crime Type



INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES

The department operates five 24-hour institutions. **Kearny Mesa and East Mesa Juvenile Detention Facilities** house male and female detainees while they are awaiting trial, placement in a treatment facility, a return to home, foster care, or as a short-term placement for violating their probation conditions.

Two detention facilities admit detainees directly from arresting agencies throughout the county as well as youth who are arrested by probation officers for failing to comply with their conditions of probation. In 2012 there were 5466 bookings into the two detention facilities. The average length of stay for detainees booked into juvenile hall and who are not released within 72 hours was 58.8 days. Seven hundred fifty-five detainees were booked and released in less than 72 hours. The average monthly census for 2012 is shown in Figure 44. The maximum and average length of stay is shown on Table 36.

Figure 43. Average Daily Attendance – Juvenile Detention Facilities





Table 37. Juvenile Detention Facilities Maximum and Average Length of Stay

| Institution | Maximum Length of Stay | Average Length of Stay |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| EMJDF | 1479 | 42 |
| KMJDF | 442 | 16 |
| CB | 329 | 159 |
| GRF | 148 | 53 |
| JRF | 182 | 41 |

Detainees were held in juvenile detention facilities for a variety of reasons. Both pre- and post-dispositional detainees were held. Thirteen percent of all detainees held in detention facilities were post-dispositional. In 2012, 21% were part of the YOU program, 15% had been committed to Breaking Cycles and 15% were short term commitments (STOP).

Figure 44. Reason for Detention at East Mesa and Kearny Mesa

The **Girl's Rehabilitation Facility** houses up to 50 female detainees for an average of four months focusing on behavior modification and substance abuse treatment. The **Juvenile Ranch Facility and Camp Barrett** are camp programs for male detainees offering substance abuse treatment, job training, education, and pro-social behavior. The camp programs have a capacity of 352 detainees on any given day. The Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of the Juvenile Ranch Facility (JRF), Camp Barrett (CB) and Girls Rehabilitation Facility (GRF) are divided among the facilities as shown in Figure 46.

Figure 45. Average Daily Attendance at the Juvenile Camps




Table 38. Detainees: Average Age and Gender by Facility *

| Institution | Average Age | Male | % | Female | % | Total |
|-------------|-------------|------|------|--------|------|-------|
| KMJDF | 15 | 148 | 73% | 56 | 27% | 204 |
| EMJDF | 16 | 215 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 215 |
| CB | 17 | 125 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 125 |
| JRF | 15 | 113 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 113 |
| GRF | 15 | 0 | 0% | 34 | 100% | 34 |

*Represents average population on any given day

Table 39. Detainees: Ethnicity by Facility *

| Institution | White | Hispanic | African American | Asian | Other | Total |
|-------------|-------|----------|------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| KMJDF | 31 | 103 | 54 | 10 | 6 | 204 |
| EMJDF | 35 | 141 | 33 | 1 | 5 | 215 |
| CB | 12 | 83 | 23 | 0 | 7 | 125 |
| JRF | 12 | 80 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 113 |
| GRF | 6 | 21 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 34 |

*Represents average population on any given day

Table 40. Detainees: Home Region by Facility *

| Region | Central | East | South | North | Other | Total |
|--------|---------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| KMJDF | 59 | 28 | 20 | 80 | 17 | 204 |
| EMJDF | 73 | 30 | 27 | 76 | 9 | 215 |
| CB | 42 | 21 | 17 | 34 | 11 | 125 |
| JRF | 24 | 12 | 15 | 54 | 8 | 113 |
| GRF | 12 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 2 | 34 |

*Represents average population on any given day

Table 41. Detainees: Most Serious Offense by Facility *

| Institution | Crime Against Person | Crime Against Property | Drug Offense | Weapon Offense | Status Offense | Other | Total |
|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|-------|-------|
| KMJDF | 102 | 57 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 27 | 204 |
| EMJDF | 107 | 58 | 12 | 11 | 2 | 25 | 215 |
| CB | 44 | 49 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 125 |
| JRF | 37 | 45 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 113 |
| GRF | 18 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 34 |

* Represents average population on any given day